

MEETING SUMMARY

MEETING NAME: WISCONSIN ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE TEAM (WEAT)

DATE: NOVEMBER 16, 2004

TIME: 8:30 A.M. TO 12:00 P.M.

LOCATION: ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, ROOM 10A

WEAT Members:

- Group Leader/Chief Enterprise Architect – Patricia Carlson (DET representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Keith Hazelton (UW representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Bud Borja (Milwaukee Co., local government representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Mickey Crittenden (Rock Co., local government representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Jay Jaeger (DOT, large state agency representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Diane Kohn (DWD, large state agency representative)
- Enterprise Architect – Judy Heil (DATCP, small state agency representative)

DET Governance:

- Michelle Eldridge (DET Domain Manager Team Lead)
- Molly Conroy (DET Governance Support Staff)

DET Development and Operations:

- Phil Schwarz (DET Operations Representative)
- Allen Poppe (DET Development Representative)

DET Infrastructure and Networks:

- Erik Mickelson (DET Infrastructure and Networks)

Keith Hazelton, Michelle Eldridge, Phil Schwarz, and Allen Poppe were absent from the meeting.

Agenda Items

1. Discussion of WEAT Documents and Meetings
2. Recommendation Template, Finalized Principles, and Scoring
3. WEAT Processes – Review Vision Diagrams
 - 4.1 Request for Recommendations from CIO
 - 4.2 Request for Recommendations from Technical Working Groups
 - 4.3 Request for Recommendations from the Data Center
 - 4.4 Implications of Recommendations – Standards and Policies
 - 4.5 Request for Architectural Review from CIO
 - 4.6 Request for Architectural Review from Technical Working Groups
 - 4.7 Request for Architectural Review from Agencies
 - 4.8 Request for Architectural Review from DOA – Budget
4. Integration Architecture – Review Outline
5. Creating EA Community – Review Outline

Action Items / Issues to Address

- *The WEAT team will continue to work on the integration architecture framework.*
- *Patricia Carlson will talk to Michelle Eldridge about getting WEAT copied on domain status reports.*
- *Patricia will check on WEAT involvement with the Applications Domain.*

- *Patricia will request Dana Perry come to the next WEAT meeting to engage in conversations on decision making, in light of the Shared Information Services Initiative (SISI).*
- *Patricia will bring the Harvard case study on outcome based measures to the next WEAT meeting.*
- *WEAT members approved the removal of the word "DRAFT" from the EA principles and to finalize the EA principles for distribution.*
- *Patricia will request that Matt announce that the principles have been finalized at the next TLC Meeting.*
- *Patricia will provide WEAT an update of her status meetings with Matt.*
- *Molly will arrange for meeting rooms for December 7 and 14 for the December WEAT Meetings.*
- *Molly will draft meeting minutes and provide them to WEAT for review.*

Meeting Notes

1. Introduction to Meeting and Review of Action Items and Updates

Patricia Carlson opened the meeting with enterprise initiative updates.

Patricia reported on the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) activities. The Department of Administration (DOA) has contracted with Salvaggio, Teal and Associates (STA) to conduct an ERP analysis and feasibility study. STA will analyze the state's administrative processes and systems and provide a recommendation on what should be the State's strategy with respect to ERP.

For the purposes of STA's analysis, DOA has chosen to define administrative services as the business functions, processes, activities, and any associated legislation or federal requirements related to procurement, human resources, budgeting, financial management and payroll.

STA developed a short survey designed to estimate potential savings the State could anticipate through either updating aging administrative systems or through the implementation of an ERP system. Patricia offered to provide these surveys to Mickey and Bud for their reference.

DET management has requested that STA attend the December Technology Leadership Council (TLC) meeting to talk about the ERP feasibility survey.

Patrick Farley, the Division of State Agency Services Administrator, has been working on a procurement study, which is focused upon the procurement activities within executive branch agencies. It is anticipated that the findings of this study will be integrated with the recommendations from STA's ERP feasibility study to prepare a budget initiative with respect to ERP.

Arthur C. Stephens, CIO of Pennsylvania (PA) and coordinator of Pennsylvania's ERP implementation has offered to provide the team looking at budget recommendations access to PA ERP implementation staff.

Corporate Executive Board

WEAT members should expect an e-mail in the coming days regarding the Corporate Executive Board and the Working Council for CIOs regarding the information resource centers. The Infrastructure Executive Council looks at corporate and state data centers and issues regarding technical operations. The Applications Executive Council deals with application development and commercial application deployment and best practices for ERP development and Web content management issues.

2. WEAT Processes – Review Vision Diagrams

Patricia has mapped diagrams for requests for recommendations from different parties that come to WEAT. Requests for recommendations coming from the CIO will include the creation of a scope of work

before it is passed to WEAT. WEAT will determine who will need to be involved with making a recommendation (e.g., the domains). WEAT will craft a recommendation to be sent to the CIO.

WEAT members discussed the need for decisions to make recommendation a policy or a standard. When it comes to project implementation, staff need to comply with applicable standards and need to be aligned with established technical strategies. The domains will make recommendations on standards and create implementation plans and strategy to determine the impacts of standards.

Agency CIOs and IT directors will be accountable to follow up to ensure that internal projects are in compliance with standards. In some cases, compliance can be monitored in the procurement audit, as part of the statutory authority of DOA. Procurements done by RFP are usually easier to audit than those done on a purchasing card or tied into other projects. For Master Lease requests, DOA hasn't been looking at standard technology or business cases tied to existing standards. DET needs to create a Master Lease template to provide samples of information to be included in a Master Lease request. WEAT needs to be involved early in the Master Lease process, not just reacting to Master Lease requests that are submitted. Communication to the TLC and Deputy Secretaries' Group will help to get WEAT involved early.

For requests submitted by technical working groups, Matt will have final approval of the scope of work. WEAT will review domain activities as far as standard and policy development. A WEAT member suggested WEAT members directly interact with the domains by participating in domain subcommittees. WEAT will need to create a connection to the Applications Domain Subcommittee, either by a WEAT member joining the subcommittee, or asking a subcommittee member to join WEAT. Domain managers need to be involved with WEAT to provide consistency in bringing forward information. Patricia will ask Michelle Eldridge to provide reports of domain activities. Currently, WEAT members involved in subcommittees are able to provide fairly immediate direction to working groups and list possible impacts of potential domain initiatives. The impact of the shared information services initiative (SISI) on domains is still unknown, but the structure of decision-making process should be documented.

Jim Schmolesky will be working with WEAT and data center staff to work on sunseting processes and emerging technologies and drivers from industry or customers. In addition to WEAT members, the domains need representation of data center staff. Agencies are providing staff to work on workgroups to report back to larger domain groups.

Agencies and the enterprise have testing needs that would be helped by creating an enterprise test lab to provide test bed environments for emerging technologies. Some agencies have a research and development lab, or are using surplus equipment to test "proof of concept" pilots. Utilization of an enterprise test lab would have to be tracked. The creation of an enterprise test lab could be a part of the "one finance system" creating an IT investment fund proposed in the Enterprise IT Plan. The plan still needs to be approved through the legislature and the budget cycle, so it remains to be seen if this initiative will remain intact. The enterprise may be able to use left-over servers, hardware and software and demo resources from vendors to do pilot work, etc. to create a test lab. Staff resource time is the largest issue. The enterprise will need a test lab that is convenient for staff doing the testing. A WEAT member suggested asking the server domain to describe what they need for a test lab and policies for when testing should be done, what should be isolated, etc.

Patricia has been working on the processes for requests for architectural reviews. WEAT has three architectural reviews coming on the horizon. Three phases were suggested for the architectural review process:

1. business – determine business issues
2. investigative – check issues in relation to other initiatives
3. assessment – relevant facts brought to WEAT at a meeting

WEAT will need resources to get the relevant facts. Two options for resources for WEAT include augmenting WEAT to have additional resources or using project managers to bring knowledge to a project. WEAT needs to support the ideas in the enterprise IT plan and provide EA services, including risk assessment. WEAT will need to determine if an issue is an architectural problem or a business problem or both. Initiatives need a business case and a defined project manager and sponsor to be considered for an

architectural review. The scope needs to come from a requestor. The sponsor should understand the business needs and articulate architectural issues for the initiative. WEAT will draft a recommendation to the CIO to look at larger business issues if needed. WEAT will also provide consulting services and check to see if an initiative fits with the enterprise IT plan and enterprise portfolio management.

A WEAT member suggested the creation of a GIS domain to develop a knowledge base for GIS. Currently, GIS is a subgroup of the Information domain. GIS crosses many areas, but needs someone to take ownership of the initiative. Some states are appointing a Geo-spatial Information Officer from the state (not usually the state cartographer). This position links GIS to other initiatives such as homeland security and recognizes the geospatial component to IT. GIS should be integrated into agency functions. WEAT can be a catalyst of relationships among groups to point out and recommend possible relationships among initiatives.

Architectural review will identify business issues and technical issues. Matt will identify the business issues and get the TLC engaged around architectural review resources and agency involvement. WEAT will need to quantify levels of work and try to scope out reasonable amounts of work. WEAT will also leverage existing research contracts to get technical insight and work with budget analysts. Each review will need input from business-area people who are invested in the business problem.

Action: *Patricia will talk to Michelle about getting WEAT copied on domain status reports.*

Patricia will check on WEAT involvement with the Applications Domain.

Patricia will request Dana Perry come to the next WEAT meeting to engage in conversations on decision making, in light of the Shared Information Services Initiative (SIS).

Patricia will bring the Harvard case study on outcome based measures to the next WEAT meeting.

4. Creating an EA Community

The WEAT members started a discussion on how to build an informal network to deal with architectural issues. WEAT needs develop an educational effort to foster an enterprise community. Matt has told Patricia that WEAT can use the Media Site Live equipment to provide education on EA and possibly to provide meetings on a secure intranet site. A WEAT member suggested that each member bring ideas for an educational marketing plan to next meeting. A member asked if Patricia's presentation from the [Digital Government Summit](#) could be presented to the Information Technology Directors Council (ITDC) and the TLC.

A WEAT member emphasized the need to get the EA principles finalized and out to be institutionalized.

Action: *WEAT members approved the removal of the word "DRAFT" from the EA principles and to finalize the EA principles for distribution.*

A WEAT member suggested creating separate documents for each principle listing the principle and to what aspect of EA it relates. These documents will link to various views of principles on the Web site. Additionally, WEAT will create a one-page overview of principle areas of the EA.

Agencies should build principles into methodologies and agency processes. WEAT will guide the development of a model to capture EA in terms people are interested in as part of service delivery. Agencies can modify project plans going forward to include WEAT principles.

It will take judgement and synthesis to see what principle is at the core of an issue because principles are not weighted. A WEAT member suggested getting feedback from agencies on which principles are most useful to agencies and how the principles are used.

A WEAT member suggested creating a document every month to disseminate information on current and future EA activities and how can staff participate. Another member suggested holding a group meeting of a couple hours every few months on agency architectural concerns. A third suggestion was to create a forum for discussion. To address this, DET looking at the public administrative rules project, and adopting a similar structure for WEAT.

WEAT members also discussed issues around appropriate development environments for applications in mainframe vs. distributed environments. WEAT discussed views around security and balancing security against applications development.

In recognition of the fact that many people will be unavailable around the end of the year, WEAT members decided to schedule WEAT meetings on December 7 and December 14.

Action: *WEAT members approved the removal of the word "DRAFT" from the EA principles and to finalize the EA principles for distribution.
Patricia will request that Matt announce that the principles have been finalized at the next TLC Meeting.
Molly will arrange for meeting rooms for December 7 and December 14 for the December WEAT Meetings.*

The WEAT meeting was then adjourned.

The next meeting is Tuesday, November 30, 8:30 to 12:30 in room 122.

#